entities affected. Moreover, due to the nature of the Federal-State relationship under the CAA, preparation of a flexibility analysis would constitute Federal inquiry into the economic reasonableness of state action. The Clean Air Act forbids EPA to base its action concerning SIPS on such grounds. *Union Electric Co.* v. *U.S. EPA*, 427 U.S. 246, 255–66 (1976); 42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(2).

#### C. Unfunded Mandates

Under Section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 ("Unfunded Mandates Act"), signed into law on March 22, 1995, EPA must prepare a budgetary impact statement to accompany any proposed or final rule that includes a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs to State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate; or to private sector, of \$100 million or more. Under Section 205, EPA must select the most cost-effective and least burdensome alternative that achieves the objectives of the rule and is consistent with statutory requirements. Section 203 requires EPA to establish a plan for informing and advising any small governments that may be significantly or uniquely impacted by the rule.

EPA has determined that the approval action proposed does not include a Federal mandate that may result in estimated costs of \$100 million or more to either State, local, or tribal governments in the aggregate, or to the private sector. This Federal action approves pre-existing requirements under State or local law, and imposes no new Federal requirements.

Accordingly, no additional costs to State, local, or tribal governments, or to the private sector, result from this action.

### List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Hydrocarbons, Intergovernmental relations, Ozone, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 7401 *et seq.* Dated: July 30, 1998.

#### Felicia Marcus,

Regional Administrator, Region IX.
[FR Doc. 98–21208 Filed 8–6–98; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 62

[OH116-1b; FRL-6134-4]

Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Ohio; Control of Landfill Gas Emissions From Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: USEPA is proposing to approve the Ohio State Plan submittal for implementing the Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) Landfill Emission Guidelines. The State's plan submittal was made pursuant to requirements found in the Clean Air Act (CAA). The State's plan was submitted to USEPA in accordance with the requirements for adoption and submittal of State plans for designated facilities in title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations part 60 (40 CFR part 60), subpart B. In the final rules section of this Federal Register, the USEPA is approving the State's request as a direct final rule without prior proposal because USEPA views this action as noncontroversial and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for approving the State's request is set forth in the direct final rule. The direct final rule will become effective without further notice unless USEPA receives relevant adverse written comment. Should USEPA receive such comment, it will publish a final rule informing the public that the direct final rule will not take effect and such public comment received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on the proposed rule. If no adverse written comments are received. the direct final rule will take effect and no further action will be taken on this proposed rule. USEPA does not plan to institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received on or before September 8, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Written comments may be mailed to J. Elmer Bortzer, Chief, Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR–18J), Region 5 at the address listed below.

Copies of the materials submitted by the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA) may be examined during normal business hours at the following locations: Regulation Development Section, Air Programs Branch (AR–18J), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 77 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois, 60604.

OEPA, Division of Air Pollution Control, 1800 Watermark Drive, Columbus, OH 43215.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Randolph O. Cano at (312) 886–6036. SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: For additional information see the direct final rule published in the rules section of this **Federal Register**.

Dated: July 24, 1998.

#### David A. Ullrich,

 $\label{eq:condition} Acting \textit{Regional Administrator, Region V.} \\ [\text{FR Doc. } 98\text{--}21031 \text{ Filed } 8\text{--}6\text{--}98; 8\text{:}45 \text{ am}]$ 

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

## GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

41 CFR Part 101-44 RIN 3090-AG77

## Donations to Service Educational Activities

**AGENCY:** Office of Governmentwide

Policy, GSA.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** This proposed rule would amend the regulation issued by GSA for donations made to educational activities of special interest to the armed services. The changes are necessary to comply with subsection 203(j)(2) of the Federal **Property and Administrative Services** Act of 1949, as amended. Subsection 203(j)(2) requires all donations of surplus property under the control of the Department of Defense (DOD) to service educational activities (SEAs) to be made through State Agencies for Surplus Property (SASPs). Currently, SEAs acquire property directly from DOD disposal facilities.

**DATES:** Submit comments on or before September 8, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Mail comments to the Personal Property Management Policy Division (MTP), Office of Governmentwide Policy, General Services Administration, 1800 F Street, NW, Washington, DC 20405.

# FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Martha Caswell, Director, Personal Property Management Policy Division (202–501–3846).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Under this rule, the SASPs will assume responsibilities that were previously performed by the DOD including: (1) distributing the donated property to the